



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,232	06/05/2006	David Loupia	FR920030069US1	3810
45095	7590	09/19/2011	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC			RECEK, JASON D	
75 STATE ST				
14 FL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALBANY, NY 12207			2442	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/19/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,232	LOUPIA, DAVID	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JASON RECEK	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
 - 5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-4, 7 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the RCE filed on June 1st 1011.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/1/11 has been entered.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are pending, of which claims 1 and 4 are currently amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see pg. 5-6, with respect to the 103(a) rejection of claim 1 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Specifically, the argument that the art does not teach or suggest the amended limitations is persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Roberts et al. US 2003/0135584 A1.

3. Applicant's comments (pg. 6-7) regarding Butterworth teaching the other amended limitation (i.e. forwarding .. to the new address of the requested web service) have been considered but are not persuasive. Examiner acknowledges that on first glance Butterworth's teaching of redirecting to "an alternate web service" seems to be materially different than the claimed limitation of forwarding "to the requested web service". However, when considering paragraph 58 in its entirety, it is clear that Butterworth teaches redirecting to a web service "that provides the same operations". Thus since a client's request is sent to a service providing the same service it is accurate to say it is directed to "the requested web service" since the client receives the requested service. Therefore, Butterworth does in fact teach forwarding to a new address of the requested web service since the request is redirected to a service "that provides the same operations". This limitation is also disclosed by the new rejection in view of Roberts as explained below.

4. Applicant's comments with respect to claim 4 (pg. 7-8) generally repeat the above, therefore they are persuasive for the same reasons. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Roberts et al. US 2003/0135584 A1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butterworth et al. US 2004/0133656 A1 in view of Lewontin US 2005/0071419 A1, Roberts et al. US 2003/0135584 A1 and Koeppel US 2005/0015491 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Butterworth discloses "redirecting a request for a web service in a data transmission network" (paragraph 45), "forwarding a first request from the client server to an address of said web service" (paragraphs 13, 44), "responding to the client server from a web service point associated with said old address" response sent from web service (Fig. 4) and "forwarding a second request from the client server to the new address of said web service" redirect (i.e. forward) to the new address of the web service (i.e. address of backup service) when failure occurs (paragraphs 58, 63).

Butterworth does not explicitly disclose "sending back a message with a header, wherein the header using said message exchange protocol contains a redirection to a new address" however this is taught by Lewontin as including a web service address in a header as a SOAP message (paragraph 44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Butterworth to include the address passing feature of Lewontin for the purpose of redirecting web service requests. Lewontin suggests that by doing so web services can be provided from mobile devices (paragraphs 9-11).

The combination of Butterworth and Lewontin does not explicitly disclose "determining the address of the web service is an old address by checking a list of outdated web services, wherein each web service in the list is associated with the old

address and a new address" however this is taught by Roberts as a forwarding address list that maps old entities to new entities (paragraph 134). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Butterworth and Lewontin with the address forwarding list taught by Roberts for the purpose of contacting an entity at its current address. This concept is well known in the art as evidenced by Roberts and yields predictable results. It has been practiced by hand every time someone opens their rolodex to see a name with an old number crossed out and a new number written in. Therefore, this is merely the combination of a known element according to its established function in order to yield predictable results.

Roberts also discloses "forwarding a second request from the client server to the new address of the requested web service" use forwarding address list to "bend" the request to new entity (paragraph 134).

The combination of Butterworth, Lewontin and Roberts does not explicitly disclose "checking, using a checker on the client server, for the redirection in the header of the message" however this is taught by Koeppel as determining whether any redirect tags are present in the data stream received from a web service, checking the entire data stream would include checking the header (paragraph 94, Fig. 13 step 1333). Although Koeppel teaches making the check / determination at the "harness", Koeppel suggests this is a virtual server that is part of the client system (paragraph 36) thus the check is made "on the client server" as recited by the claims. Also, Butterworth discloses that the client (e.g. agent acting as client) performs the redirection check

(paragraph 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Butterworth, Lewontin and Roberts with the redirect checking taught by Koeppel for the purpose of authentication. Koeppel teaches allowing only web services that are authorized (paragraph 14, Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 2, Butterworth discloses “new address … is logged by said host” as storing an address in the form of a WSDL file (paragraphs 13-14).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Butterworth, Lewontin and Roberts does not explicitly disclose “said redirection is a SOAP header tag”, however Butterworth does disclose “message exchange protocol is SOAP” (Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a header tag for redirection. The SOAP specification provides header blocks. Redirecting requests is disclosed by the references. Thus naming a header tag redirect would have been obvious since that is the purpose of the message. This is similar to relaying a SOAP message, when doing so the SOAP specification provides for a header block that is aptly named relay.

Regarding claim 4, it is a system claim that corresponds to the method of claim 1; those corresponding parts (web service, address redirection, response message) are rejected for similar reasons. Butterworth also discloses “a checker in a SOAP runtime”

as software for passing SOAP messages (Fig. 4, paragraphs 37, 44-45). The message is analyzed/checked (paragraph 38).

Regarding claim 7, Butterworth discloses “HTTP” (paragraph 11).

Regarding claim 8, it is a system claim that corresponds to the method of claim 7, therefore it is rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Snapp et al. US 2006/0020575 A1 discloses that it is well known in the art to have an address list containing an old address and a new address (paragraph 6).

Knutson et al. US 2005/0160153 A1 discloses a method of addressing web services (abstract) including correcting an outdated address (paragraph 64).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON RECEK whose telephone number is (571)270-1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Recek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2442
(571) 270-1975